EXHIBIT A



WALLA WALLA COUNTY CLERK

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WALLA WALLA

GEORGE RAPP, individually,

19 2 00415 36

Cause No.

Plaintiff,

SUMMONS

VS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FRANKLIN COUNTY, a Municipal Corporation; and FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF JIM RAYMOND, in his individual and official capacity,

Defendants.

TO THE DEFENDANTS: FRANKLIN COUNTY, a municipal corporation; and FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF JIM RAYMOND

A lawsuit has been started against you in the above-entitled court by Plaintiff GEORGE RAPP. Plaintiff's claim is stated in the written Complaint, a copy of which is served upon you with this Summons.

In order to defend against this lawsuit, you must respond to the Complaint by stating your defense in writing, and by serving a copy upon the person signing this Summons within 20 days after the service of this Summons, excluding the day of service, or within 60 days if this Summons was served outside the State of Washington, or a Default Judgment may be entered against you without notice. A Default Judgment is one where Plaintiff is entitled to what he asks for because you have not responded. If you serve a Notice of Appearance on the undersigned person, you are entitled to notice before a Default Judgment may be entered.

You may demand that the Plaintiff file this lawsuit with the court. If you do so, the demand must be in writing and must be served upon the person signing this Summons. Within

Summons Page 1 TELQUIST MCMILLEN CLARE, PLLC 1321 Columbia Park Trail Richland, Washington 99352 PH: 509.737.8500 FAX: 509.737.9500

14 days after you serve the demand, the Plaintiff must file this lawsuit with the court, or the service on you of this Summons and Complaint will be void.

If you wish to seek the advice of an attorney in this matter, you should do so promptly so that your written response, if any, may be served on time.

This Summons is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Superior Court Civil Rules of the State of Washington.

DATED this 23rd day of May, 2019.

TELQUIST McMILLEN CLARE, PLLC

By:

ANDREA J. CLARE, WSBA #37889 GEORGE E. TELQUIST, WSBA #27203

Attorneys for Plaintiffs



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WALLA WALLA

GEORGE RAPP individually,

Cause NS. 00415 36

11

Plaintiff,

Vs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FRANKLIN COUNTY, a Municipal Corporation; and FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF JIM RAYMOND, in his individual

16 and official capacity,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT AND ACTION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

COMES NOW the Plaintiff, by and through his attorneys of record, Telquist McMillen Clare PLLC and hereby allege as follows:

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1.1 This is an action for damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 based upon the continuing violations of Plaintiff's rights under the 4th, 5th and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution and the Washington State Constitution. Plaintiff seeks declaratory relief and maintains claims under state law. This court has original and supplemental jurisdiction over this action.

Complaint Page 1

TELQUIST MCMILLEN CLARE, PLLC 1321 Columbia Park Trail Richland, Washington 99352 PH: 509.737.8500 FAX: 509.737.9500

1.2 Venue is proper in Walla Walla County pursuant to RCW 36.01.050 as Franklin County, a municipal corporation located in the State of Washington is a party. At all relevant times and the events/conduct complained of herein occurred in Franklin County by the Franklin County Sheriff's Office by and through the Franklin County Sheriff Jim Raymond, under the color of state law.

1.3 Franklin County Sheriff Jim Raymond is a resident of Franklin County, Washington. Franklin County Sheriff Jim Raymond has the exclusive authority to hire, fire, control the working conditions, terms of employment, responsibilities, and assign the chain of command for each individual employed by the Franklin County Sheriff's Office which is organized within the municipal corporation of Franklin County.

II. FACTUAL BASIS

2.1 On May 9, 2016 by and through the Franklin County Sheriff, Jim Raymond (hereinafter 'Sheriff Raymond'), the Franklin County Sheriff's Office terminated the employment of Franklin County Deputy George Rapp (Deputy Rapp). Subsequently, Sheriff Raymond and/or designees of the Franklin County Sheriff's Office have made and published false derogatory statements concerning Deputy Rapp's character/honesty. Such false derogatory statements have significantly damaged Deputy Rapp's character and rendered him unemployable in any other local law enforcement capacity.

2.2 Deputy Rapp timely filed a grievance challenging his termination from the Franklin County Sheriff's Office. Pursuant to the Deputy's Collective Bargaining Agreement, an arbitration was held on March 13-17 and 22, 2017, in Pasco, Washington. During the arbitration, Sheriff Raymond stated he would never 'bring Rapp back' under any circumstances.

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

2.3 On or about September 5, 2017, the arbitrator issued his opinion and award sustaining Deputy Rapp's grievance. The arbitrator found the termination failed to meet the standards of just cause pursuant to the Deputy's Collective Bargaining Agreement. arbitration award ordered Deputy Rapp to be reinstated with pay and benefits retroactive to May 9, 2016. Nevertheless, Franklin County Sheriff's Office and/or Sheriff Raymond independently and with bad faith failed to reinstate Deputy Rapp.

- 2.4 Franklin County deliberately chose to disregard the arbitrator's decision. Rather, the County initiated formal legal action by filing an improper appeal in Benton County Superior Court.
- 2.5 Later, Franklin County motioned to transfer the appeal to Columbia County causing Deputy Rapp to incur unnecessary delay. Deputy Rapp successfully had the appeal returned to Franklin County. Upon hearing, the judge stayed the County's appeal and remanded the action back to the arbitrator for additional findings if desired. Franklin County did not return or seek relief from the arbitrator thereafter.
- 2.6 Nearly three (3) years after he was improperly terminated, on January 3, 2019, Franklin County elected to follow the arbitrator's decision and ordered Deputy Rapp to return to work for "reinstatement" on January 7, 2019. Deputy Rapp was not permitted to negotiate or inquire of the "order" nor the terms of employment. Instead, Franklin County insisted that Deputy Rapp return to work as "ordered" or face terminated for insubordination.
- 2.7 Deputy Rapp was thereafter paid an amount purportedly based upon the arbitrator's award but only as determined/defined unilaterally by Franklin County. Franklin County did not consider any overtime wages, insurance costs, and/or misc items authorized under the Deputy's Collective Bargaining Agreement.

2.8 Deputy Rapp was "reinstated" into a position where he would be working the day shift as a correction's deputy in the jail as opposed to the road deputy position for which he was improperly terminated in May 2016.

2.9 On Monday, January 7, 2019, Deputy Rapp showed up for work as directed by Franklin County Sheriff's office at 8:00 a.m. Commander Sultemeier took him in his office, but said he couldn't do anything with Deputy Rapp until he signed papers with Human Resources. Human Resources indicated they were unaware Deputy Rapp was coming in and that he would have to return at 10:00 a.m.

2.10 Deputy Rapp asked that any previous write-ups in his file be removed because he had not been written up in eighteen (18) months per the Deputy's Collective Bargaining Agreement. Captain Diaz was unaware of the contract, but informed Deputy Rapp that his write-ups request needed to be done in writing. Captain Diaz informed him that the writings should come from his County e-mail, to which Deputy Rapp was not yet assigned. Deputy Rapp was then directed back to Commander Sultemeier.

2.11 Deputy Rapp was advised that he would be working under the Deputy's Collective Bargaining Agreement contract, albeit in corrections (jail). Deputy Rapp would be the only employee working in the jail under the Deputy's contract as all the other jail employees fall under the Corrections Collective Bargaining contract.

2.12 Deputy Rapp was further advised that he would not receive his commission because Franklin County Sheriff Raymond was not willing to commission Deputy Rapp. Deputy Rapp is the only deputy under the Deputy's Collective Bargaining contract that has not received his commission from the Sheriff. As a result of Deputy Rapp's unemployment period,

 caused by Franklin County, he will have to complete basic training in order to become a commissioned officer again.

- 2.13 Deputy Rapp was further advised that he would not be receiving a take-home car in his current position. This was a benefit he received in his former position, pre-termination. Deputy Rapp is the only deputy under the Deputy's Collective Bargaining contract that is not permitted a take-home car from the Franklin County Sheriff's Office.
- 2.14 Deputy Rapp was given key card entry access to only the outside perimeter gates and the jail back door after 're-instatement'. Deputy Rapp is the only deputy employed by the Franklin County Sheriff's Office that is denied access to other points which are authorized to every other Franklin County Sheriff deputy. When Deputy Rapp had questions regarding his access, he was told to ask Franklin County Sheriff Raymond.
- 2.15 Deputy Rapp was further advised that his employment in the jail required he would be receiving PERS retirement. Deputy Rapp is the only employee of the Franklin County Sheriff's Office that is receives PERS retirement as all other deputies participate in the LEOFF retirement program. Consequently, after deputy Rapp was 're-instated' his retirement contributions will have started anew in the PERS retirement program.
- 2.16 After he was 're-instated' Deputy Rapp was informed that his chain of command would be Commander Sultemeier as opposed to the Franklin County Sheriff Jim Raymond. He was further advised that both the County's deputy policies and the corrections policies applied to him. Deputy Rapp is the only employee for which both policies apply.
- 2.17 Deputy Rapp was on his lunch break by the sheriff's office door that every other Franklin County deputy has access except him. Commander Rochleau was walking up to the door and Deputy Rapp asked him if he could please have access and be escorted to the Coke

 machine around the corner. Deputy Rapp was embarrassed and humiliated because he had to ask another employee for access which is afforded to other County employees.

2.18 Deputy Rapp has been "re-instated" and stationed in Master Control of the County jail. Deputy Rapp has been strategically placed in a position/location that would prevent him from access to all other personnel and/or contact with anyone of authority. Deputy Rapp is unable to advance in his "re-instated" position as oppose to the position he was improperly terminated. He is also the highest paid corrections employee.

2.19 On Thursday, January 10, 2019, Officer Austin was assigned in Master Control. Officer Austin informed Deputy Rapp that he had been assigned to Master Control since October. He stated that he was placed on administrative leave for a week, then they said to come work in Master Control Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. until the investigation was over. Employees of Franklin County Sheriff's Office perceive Master Control is a temporary/permanent punishment post.

2.20 Deputy Rapp was informed by Officer Steve Warren that there would be a union meeting on January 23, 2019, in the sheriff's training room. Deputy Rapp told Warren that he does not have access to the sheriff's office. Officer Warren stated that he had asked Franklin County Sheriff Raymond, and the sheriff indicated, "as long as the meeting is after zero-dark-thirty, you [Steve] can escort George to the training room and then escort him out when it's over."

2.21 Deputy Warren informed Deputy Rapp that the sheriff was closing the gym on the second floor and Deputy Warren stated that there was a bench machine that belonged to Deputy Rapp. He further advised the Sheriff had demanded all the equipment was to be removed from the gym as it is now closed. Deputy Rapp removed his bench he had donated years ago.

 Subsequently, the gym has remained open. Deputy Rapp does not have access to the gym. Every other Franklin County Sheriff Deputy has access and authorization to utilize the gym.

2.22 Deputy Rapp was issued access to the Power DMS system, which is where Franklin County employment policies are located. He was also assigned a correction training officer (CTO). CTO Dallas advised Deputy Rapp that he would be going over the CTO binder, but most of it would not apply to Deputy Rapp because he would only be assigned to Master Control. Officer Dallas further indicated that Officer Austin would observe Deputy Rapp as Officer Dallas would not be in Master Control. Nevertheless, Officer Dallas would fill out Deputy Rapp's book and conduct the performance review on what Deputy Austin told him. Deputy Rapp confirmed several provisions in the policies, such as the chain of command, do not apply to him which make following the required policies and procedures for his current position impossible. Without a clear policy or written direction as to which policies apply and which do not, Deputy Rapp has been set up to fail and/or be terminated for not following Franklin County policies.

2.23 Deputy Rapp spoke with Commander Sultemeier about testing for the Jail Lieutenant position. Deputy Rapp asked if he was "eligible to test given his special circumstances" and Commander Sultemeier replied that he was not considered special. He further disagreed that Rapp is the only deputy working in the jail. He also corrected the statement to indicate Rapp is the only employee working in the jail that can only work in Master Control and can't work booking or the floor. Commander Sultemeier then said, "let's be honest and real with each other. You, your attorney, and the County's attorney have an agreement in place." Deputy Rapp corrected Commander Sultemeier, indicating there is no agreement, the County offered me this and my attorney responded that we do not accept the County's offer, to

which the County replied that it is not simply an offer, it is an order and therefore, Deputy Rapp was just complying with the County's order. Commander Sultemeier said he was not privy to that information.

2.24 Deputy Rapp requested to see his personnel file from Human Resources and the HR representative advised that it was completely torn apart and they were working on putting it back together with information that should and/or shouldn't be in there. Deputy Rapp later asked Captain Rochleau to see his working file, and he indicated that he would try to gain access to the file. A few hours later, Captain Rochleau advised Deputy Rapp that he had gotten access but could not find the file on Deputy Rapp. Deputy Rapp asked if he could send him an e-mail regarding his search but Captain Rochleau indicated he did not feel comfortable sending that in an e-mail.

2.25 Commander Sultemeier advised Deputy Rapp the Franklin County Sheriff had changed his title as a "Corrections Deputy" to the official title of "Franklin County Sheriff Office Employee". Deputy Rapp requested to know the contract that title falls under, and Commander Sultemeier indicated that he was still under the Deputy Contract. When Deputy Rapp suggested that employee's titles are specifically outlined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement and RCWs such that any "title change" could impact application of the Contract, Commander Sultemeier indicated that this is the agreement that your attorney worked out with the County. Deputy Rapp replied there was 'no agreement' that he was ordered to return to work in his current position and he complied with the County's directive. The Commander reminded Deputy Rapp that the Franklin County Sheriff had made the determination and that the Commander didn't have all the answers to provide Deputy Rapp. Deputy Rapp indicated that he would prefer that the Franklin County Sheriff, Commander Sultemeier's boss, advise

him what is going on, or perhaps the three of them could have a discussion to answer the questions that need to be answered. Commander Sultemeier laughed, and indicated "you and I both know that's not going to happen".

2.26 On or about February 27, 2019, Officer Rapp reported to HR at 8:00 a.m. as instructed. He provided notes from the dentist and endodontics excusing his work absences. The HR representative indicated that the notes needed to say, he is "released to full duty". Deputy Rapp asked if he could work today, and was told that he could not until he got notes with that statement. Deputy Rapp went back to the Commander to inform him that he could not work his shift. Deputy Rapp returned to HR to provide further explanation regarding his extended absence in that he had simply planned to have procedure and requested days off. The HR representative indicated "it's not us, it's the sheriff". Deputy Rapp again went back and reported to the Commander who indicated that he needed to make sure he got his "sick slip for the 4 hours today". Deputy Rapp replied that he was either on paid time or admin leave when the County sent him to the dentist to get further clearance, per his Contract he was to give the County a doctor's note after a 3-day absence which he did at 8:00 that morning. The Commander indicated it's the County's right to get more if requested.

2.27 On or about March 11, 2019 while on lunch break, Deputy Rapp observed Coke employees removing the previously-mentioned Coke machine from under the stairs where it had been located previously.

2.28 Commander Rochleau put out an e-mail for anyone interested in buying their old service pistols. Deputy Rapp responded that he would like to purchase his old pistol. The Commander indicated he would notify Deputy Rapp on the paperwork when everything was done. Deputy Rapp was later informed that he had to give money to the Commander for the

pistols. While Deputy Rapp was in the parking lot on his lunch break, Commander Rochleau walked by. Deputy Rapp said he was told to give him money today, and he would like to do so. Commander Rochleau was unaware of what Deputy Rapp was speaking about. Deputy Rapp indicated he was talking about the old pistol purchasing program. Commander Rochleau said, "Well for you it's different because you don't have a commission and I can't sell you a gun". Deputy Rapp inquired since the guns were being sold to everyone else in the jail. The Commander replied that they have a limited commission. Deputy Rapp inquired as to why he doesn't have a commission. Commander replied that it was "above him".

2.29 On or about March 15, 2019, Pasco Police Officer Esavis brought a Coca-Cola to Deputy Rapp in booking. The booking officer called Deputy Rapp in Master Control to come get it. Deputy Rapp took no more than five minutes to obtain the Coke and expressed appreciation. As Deputy Rapp was headed back to Master Control, Officer Haddocks told him on the intercom that Commander Sultemeier wanted to see him. Deputy Rapp went to the Commander's office and was asked what he was doing in booking. Deputy Rapp replied that a Pasco Police Officer purchased him a Coke and he went to pick it up. The Commander told Deputy Rapp he is not allowed to go past the break room.

- 2.30 On or about March 25, 2019, corrections officer Burgess asked Deputy Rapp why he wasn't paying into the Corrections Union since he was working in the jail. Deputy Rapp told her he was part of the Road Deputy's Union and pays dues there. Later, Deputy Rapp asked the Commander to be off on April 2-3 and the Commander replied that it was fine "since you have no one to compete for a vacation with, since you're on your own program up there".
- 2.31 Deputy Rapp complains that the position he was wrongfully terminated in 2016 is not consistent with the newly created position the Franklin County Sheriff's Office has

officially reinstated him. The net effect of this position/title change is to persuade Deputy Rapp to simply quit. Additional and further retaliation has been directed toward Deputy Rapp which continues presently. Such retaliation and false statements previously made/published have resulted in significant emotional, economic, psychological, reputational, and physical damages.

III. CAUSES OF ACTION

- 3.1 <u>Retaliation by employer</u>. RCW 49.60.210 and RCW 51.48.025; Upon filing a grievance and prevailing, the defendant(s) have engaged in systematic retaliation against the plaintiff;
- 3.2 <u>Violation of the Washington law against discrimination</u>. RCW 49.60.010 et seq. Whereby the plaintiff engaged in statutorily protected activity, the defendant(s) took adverse employment actions against plaintiff/employee, and there is a causal link between the protected activity and the adverse action;
- 3.3 <u>Deprivation of civil rights</u>. 42 USC §1983 Whereby the defendant(s) acted under color of state law and such conduct deprived plaintiff of rights protected by the U.S. Constitution including but not limited to the 4th Amendment, 5th Amendment & 14th Amendment and the Washington State Constitution, Article I Section 3 to which the plaintiff has sustained damages;
- 3.4 <u>Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act</u>. RCW 7.24.020 Pursuant to state law, plaintiff maintains employment rights under the Deputies Collective Bargaining Agreement and such rights and/or the status of such rights may be determined/declared by a court of law;

3.5 <u>Defamation</u>. Defendant(s) have defamed the character of plaintiff by issuing false statements/publications which have caused plaintiff significant damages.

IV. PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 4.1 For declaratory relief against the Defendant(s);
- 4.2 For judgment against the Defendant(s), in an amount to be proven at the time of trial;
- 4.3 For any and all damages, including compensatory and punitive damages as allowed under 42 U.S.C. §1983;
 - 4.4 For attorney's fees and costs reasonably incurred; and
 - 4.5 For all other relief the Court deems just and equitable.

DATED this 23rd day of May, 2019.

TELQUIST McMILLEN CLARE, PLLC Attorneys for Plaintiff

By:

ANDREA J. CLÄRE, WSBA #37889 GEORGE E. TELQUIST, WSBA #27203





8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON	
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WALLA WALLA	
10	GEORGE RAPP, individually,	Cause No. 19-2-00415-36
12	Plaintiff,	AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE
13	ys.	
14 15	Corporation: and FRANKLIN COUNTY	
16	and official capacity,	
17	Defendants.	
18 19 20	STATE OF WASHINGTON) :ss County of AMIN)	•
21	I, KRISTI FLYG, being first duly sworn, upon oath, depose and state:	
22	That I am over the age of 21 years; that on or about the 23 day of May,	
23	2019, at 3:15 a.m./p.m., I personally served one copy of the following:	
24	1) SUMMONS; AND	
25	2) COMPLAINT.	
27		
28		

2

3

4

5

6

7

Case 4:19-cv-05150-SAB ECF No. 1-3 filed 06/06/19 PageID.25 Page 17 of 22



JUN - 3 2019

KATHY MARTIN WALLA WALLA COUNTY CLERK

8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON	
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WALLA WALLA	
10	GEORGE RAPP, individually,	10 1 6 1/10 34
11	Plaintiff,	Cause No. 19–2-00415-36
12	r iaiitiii,	AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE
13	vs.	
14	FRANKLIN COUNTY, a Municipal	
15	Corporation; and FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF JIM RAYMOND, in his individual	
16	and official capacity,	
17	Defendants.	
18	STATE OF WASHINGTON)	
19	County of Franklin :ss	
20		
21	I, KEN TAYLOR, being first duly sworn, upon oath, depose and state:	
22	That I am over the age of 21 years; that on or about the ZB day of May,	
23	2019, ata.m.(p.m.) I personally served one copy of the following:	
24	1) SUMMONS; AND	
25	2) COMPLAINT	
26	2) COMPLAINT.	4
27		
28		

Affidavit of Service Page 1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

TELQUIST MCMILLEN CLARE, PLLC 1321 Columbia Park Trail Richland, Washington 99352 PH: 509.737.8500 FAX: 509.737.9500

LORI A ENGELHARD
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF WASHINGTON
COMMISSION EXPIRES
JANUARY 19, 2021

б

Affidavit of Service Page 2 TELQUIST McMILLEN CLARE, PLLC 1321 Columbia Park Trail Richland, Washington 99352 PH: 509.737.8500 FAX: 509.737.9500

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

2021

2223

24

26

25

27

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WALLA WALLA

GEORGE RAPP, individually,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRANKLIN COUNTY, a municipal corporation; and FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF JIM RAYMOND, in his individual and official capacity,

Defendants.

No. 19-2-00415-36

NOTICE OF APPEARANCE

(Clerk's Action Required)

TO: GEORGE RAPP, Plaintiff

AND TO: Andrea J. Clare and George E. Telquist, Attorneys for Plaintiff

AND TO: THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT

YOU, AND EACH OF YOU, WILL PLEASE BE ADVISED that the undersigned appears as attorney of record for Defendants FRANKLIN COUNTY; and FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFF JIM RAYMOND. Defendants, without waiving any defects as to lack of jurisdiction over subject matter, lack of jurisdiction over person, improper venue, insufficiency of process, insufficiency of service of process, misjoinder or nonjoinder, hereby requests that any and all further pleadings or notices of any nature or kind whatsoever affecting the rights of said parties, except original process, be served upon the undersigned attorneys at the address stated below.

Case 4:19-cv-05150-SAB ECF No. 1-3 filed 06/06/19 PageID.29 Page 21 of 22

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on May 29, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties listed below via E-mail and US Mail

Attorneys for

Andrea J. Clare, WSBA #37889 George E. Telquist, WSBA #27203 Telquist Ziobro McMillen Clare PLLC 1321 Columbia Park Trl Richland, WA 99352-4735 Email: andrea@tmc.law george@tmc.law

DATED this 29th day of May, 2019, at Seattle, Washington.

Tia Uy, Legal Assistant